

United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington
Magistrate Judge Mary K. Dimke
Richland

USA v. JOSE MENDOZA-RUELAS Case No. 4:21-CR-06028-RMP-1

Richland Video Conference
The Defendant agreed to appear via video conference.

**Defendant's Motion to Reopen Detention Hearing
(ECF No. 80):**

11/18/2021

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sara Gore, Courtroom Deputy [R] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephanie Van Marter, US Atty [R] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erica Helms, US Probation / Pretrial Services (tele) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Mirr, Defense Atty (video) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody USM appearing by telephone from Yakima County Jail | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter – Natalia Rivera (video)
Interpreter NOT REQUIRED |
| <hr/> | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Conditions of Release imposed |

REMARKS

Due to the current COVID-19 public health crisis, all parties including Defendant, appeared by video or teleconference.

Defendant advises the Court he would like his hearing to be in-person.

Defense counsel advises Defendant is prepared to go forward today; Defendant concurs.

Defense counsel argued why there are conditions which justify reconsidering the issues of detention and that such conditions will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required. Defense counsel argues Defendant's ties to the community, minimal criminal history, and GPS monitoring. Defendant has a friend who is willing to post a bond.

USA argued that there are no conditions which justify reconsidering the issues of detention or that there are no conditions which will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required and/or the safety of the community. USA adds information regarding previous arrest and failure to appear for ICE using a different alias in which he stated was his true name.

Colloquy between Court and USA regarding previous arrest.

The Court ordered:

1. Defendant's Motion to Reopen Detention is **denied**.
2. Defendant's Motion to Expedite Hearing is **granted**
3. The Court ruled that it will abide by its earlier determination.
4. The Court ruled that there are no conditions which justify reconsidering the issue of bail or that there are conditions of release which will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required.
5. Defendant shall be detained by the U.S. Marshal until further order of the Court.